UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Jonathan Daniel Clements,
Appellant,

v.

State of Arkansas, et al
Appellees.

Case No.25-3497

Mandamus Petition and Notice of Compulsion for Emergency Judicial Oversight

I. INTRODUCTION AND JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY

This Mandamus Petition is filed under the supervisory authority of the United States Court of Appeals, invoking emergency jurisdiction due to immediate, demonstrable injury resulting from administrative misconduct, clerical denial of filings, and deprivation of due process in the Booneville District Court, Logan County, Arkansas. Petitioner seeks extraordinary relief based on verifiable procedural abuse, record alteration, and a willful pattern of retaliation against ecclesiastical authority and trust equity.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On or around **November 20, 2025**, during proceedings in Booneville District Court, the presiding judge **verbally and manually entered the next court appearance date as January 9, 2026**, doing so **in open court and in the presence of the petitioner**.

Immediately following that hearing, the petitioner publicly livestreamed on the platform X (formerly Twitter), stating the judge had set the date as January 9th and documented that date in a follow-up post with photographic support. No other date was referenced, and no post-hearing amendments were served.

The petitioner relied upon the stated date and traveled six miles by foot on January 9, 2026, to appear for court as ordered. Upon arriving at the courthouse, it was **vacant**. The petitioner was redirected to the **Booneville Clerk's Office**, where the clerk **rudely stated** that the court date was actually **January 8th, 2026**, and falsely claimed the petitioner had missed court.

The clerk refused to retrieve or review the case file when asked, **refused to allow the petitioner to verify** the assigned date on record, and **provided no documentation, docket printout, or official record** showing the date had ever been moved.

The petitioner called his bondsman (Billy), who confirmed the court date on his documentation was **January 9, 2026**, and expressed confusion about the alleged change. The bondsman affirmed that **January 8th is not a standard court date** for misdemeanors in Booneville,

The petitioner has kept all relevant documents, including the original bond, written statements, and copies of live-streamed confirmation.

The Sheriff's Office confirmed that a **failure to appear (FTA)** is now active against the petitioner and will go into full effect next week. This FTA is **fraudulent**, as the petitioner appeared in good faith on the date assigned and has continued to notify the Appeals Court of escalating retaliation.

The petitioner submitted formal notice to the federal court on record regarding the ecclesiastical trust and its relevance, which was denied by the Booneville clerk's office, under verbal instructions from the judge, **who refused to accept any documents**.

III. INJURY AND PREJUDICE

The lower court has:

Refused to allow constitutional filing access.

Created a condition for false FTA prosecution.

Committed administrative retaliation after receiving federal trust filings.

Demonstrated bias and deliberate indifference to petitioner's rights.

Petitioner has suffered emotional distress, risk of arrest, reputational harm, and potential detainment due to a **failure engineered by court personnel** rather than by any absence of appearance or intent.

IV. RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner respectfully requests the Court of Appeals to:

Issue a writ of mandamus compelling the Booneville District Court to correct its record and rescind the failure to appear.

Order immediate judicial oversight of Booneville District Court regarding its handling of filings, case date modifications, and refusal to document proceedings.

Stay any warrant or legal process pending resolution of the appeal and investigation into procedural misconduct.

Acknowledge the public ecclesiastical record and existing federal notices on file.

Permit digital or mail-based filing access for petitioner to reduce hardship.

V. CONCLUSION

This Court is the last available avenue for preventing the abuse of administrative discretion from becoming a systemic violation of equity, due process, and ecclesiastical immunity. The petitioner has acted in good faith and in reliance upon judicial instruction, only to be punished for following it.

The record now requires federal correction.

Respectfully submitted,

Executor, Jonathan Clements

Petitioner, In Propria Persona
ECC-TRUST-JDC-005
[Date: January 10, 2026]

Pro Nunc Tunc In Perpituity Ad Infintum